

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 5, 2003. Claims 1 to 32 and 34 are in the application, of which Claim 1 is the only independent claim under consideration. Claims 6 to 8, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 to 25, 31, 32 and 34 have been withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement entered on January 23, 2003. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

With respect to the withdrawn claims, Applicants again respectfully assert that Claim 1, even as amended, is generic to all claims pending herein. Amendments have been made to some of the withdrawn claims, for consistency with amendments made to Claim 1. Accordingly, upon an indication of allowability for Claim 1, rejoinder of all claims herein is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 5, 9 and 8 to 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent 5,880,653 (Yamada) in view of Japan 200-235152 (Victor); Claims 10, 13, 16 and 33 were rejected under § 103(a) over Yamada in view of U.S. Patent 4,553,118 (Agatahama); and Claims 17 and 26 to 30 were rejected under § 103(a) over Yamada in view of U.S. Patent 6,541,831 (Lee). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested, as explained in more detail below.

The invention concerns a movable-body apparatus in which a movable body is supported around a twisting longitudinal axis. The movable body includes top and bottom planar surfaces, and along the bottom planar surface, a moving core is formed of a

magnetic material. The moving core has a face opposed to a stationary portion in a planar direction of the movable body. According to one aspect of the invention, a superimposed area exists between a part of the face of the stationary portion and a part of a the face of the moving core where a size of the superimposed area is changed when the movable body is tilted when viewed from the planar direction of the movable body. According to a further aspect, the superimposed area exists below the bottom planar surface of the movable body.

By virtue of the foregoing arrangement, a width of the movable body (in the planar direction thereof) may be relatively narrower than that of conventional apparatuses. As an example, in comparison with the Victor reference, an embodiment of the present invention shows a remarkably narrowed width in the planar direction thereof.

Thus, as set forth in independent Claim 1, as amended, a movable-body apparatus comprises a first support member and a movable body having top and bottom planar surfaces. Supporting means has a twisting longitudinal axis, and supports the movable body relative to the first support member. Driving means tilts the movable body in a tilting direction about the twisting longitudinal axis, the driving means including a stationary portion provided apart from the movable body, and a moving core formed of a magnetic material. The moving core is provided on the bottom planar surface of the movable body. The stationary portion and the moving core have faces opposed to each other in a planar direction of the movable body, wherein a superimposed area exists between a part of the face of the stationary portion and that of the moving core. A size of the superimposed area is changed when the movable body is tilted when viewed from the

planar direction of the movable body, and the superimposed area also exists directly below the bottom planar surface of the movable body.

The applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest the foregoing arrangement, particularly as regards an arrangement wherein a superimposed area between faces of a stationary portion and a moving core changes when a movable body is tilted when viewed from a planar direction of the movable body, and as regards the positioning of the superimposed area which exists directly below a bottom planar surface of the movable body.

Yamada, for example, as correctly conceded in the Office Action, does not show faces of a stationary portion and a moving core opposed to each other in a direction perpendicular to a tilting direction, and does not show that the superimposed portion changes when the movable body is tilted. It is further asserted that Yamada does not show that the superimposed area exists directly below a bottom planar surface of its movable body.

The Victor reference was relied on as allegedly showing opposed faces of a stationary portion and a moving core. Regardless of what is shown in Victor, it is Applicants' understanding that any superimposed area exists only outside of the movable body, and not directly below a bottom planar surface of the movable body. As a consequence, the device shown in the Victor reference cannot partake of the advantageous effects of the invention claimed herein.

The Agatahama patent has been reviewed, but is not seen to add anything to the above-noted deficiencies in the Yamada and Victor references.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that the claims herein are fully in condition for allowance, and that rejoinder of the withdrawn claims is also proper.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California, office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael D. O'Neill
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 32622

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-2200
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 77828 v 1